

Belvedere:
Jerry Butler

Corte Madera:
Melissa Gill

Fairfax:
Lew Tremaine

Larkspur:
Joan Lundstrom

Mill Valley:
Dick Swanson

Novato:
Pat Eklund

Ross:
Tom Byrnes

San Anselmo:
Peter Breen

San Rafael:
Al Boro

Sausalito:
Amy Belser

Tiburon:
Alice Fredericks

County of Marin:
Susan Adams
Hal Brown
Steve Kinsey
Cynthia Murray
Annette Rose

MINUTES

MARIN TRANSPORTATION AND LAND USE SOLUTIONS (T-PLUS) ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING #4

MONDAY, AUGUST 19, 2004

4:00 P.M.

**DPW Room 304 Conference Room
MARIN CIVIC CENTER
3501 Civic Center Drive
San Rafael, CA 94903**

Attending:

Al Boro
Larry Chu
Barbara Collins
Elizabeth Irvine Eells
Phil Erickson
Wendy Kallins
Harvey Katz
Trent Lethco
Nader Mansourian
Bob Pendoley
Michele Rodriguez
Valerie Taylor
Amy Van Doren
Craig Thomas Yates

1. Introductions

The meeting started at 4:10 p.m. Introductions were made.

2. July 08, 2004 Meeting Minutes

Valerie Taylor should be added as attending. There were no additional comments on the meeting minutes, which were accepted by the TPLUS AC members.

3. Discussion on Draft Regional TLC/HIP Program Guidelines

Lethco explained the changes to the document. He noted that MTC staff expressed concern with the \$150K minimum, suggesting no lower than \$300K. Lethco noted that MTC staff wants to respect each county's uniqueness, but MTC wants to be good stewards of the funds by being realistic about the administrative burden. Kallins noted that SR2S projects are typically over \$300K, but noted that the smaller amount would allow more jurisdictions to have a shot at the funds.

Lethco noted that this would be a pilot cycle and that TAM will regroup after the cycle to determine needed adjustments. Two handouts were distributed titled "Current Award Structure" and "Possible Doubling" that provide details on the amount of funding based upon the type and size of project. Erickson explained that a study of PROPDEV and interviews with each jurisdiction was done to determine what projects in the last couple years would have likely qualified for HIP funding. This is one of the things that created the concern with the \$500K minimum threshold because the only jurisdictions that could have qualified would be San Rafael and Novato. That is why it was suggested to go with the lower level.

Lethco suggested that we provide this material to MTC staff so they can appreciate how we arrived at the \$150K level. Collins noted that there is such an administrative burden involved with these funds and it would be helpful to have the process explained. Lethco offered to explain the E-76 Form process, but it would take approximately an hour or two. Mansourian added that it takes a full time staff to complete all the required steps involved with this funding. Lethco noted that that is why the eligibility requirements list is so long.

Rodriguez asked staff to explain whether there are other agencies that package their program. How can we better communicate with communities other than just San Rafael and Novato. Lethco explained that a lot of these programs are biased towards more urbanized communities and that many smaller cities/towns are left out of the eligibility. He noted that we have a choice in whether we want to offer the HIP program or not; and that some other counties are only offering a TLC Program. Collins noted that the numbers shown are from PROPDEV and only show those projects that are locked in or in process, not what might be coming in the future.

Lethco explained the "Possible Doubling" handout, which explains an option of offering more money to smaller projects that are closer to transit in order to have these smaller projects qualify more quickly. With this option, a couple single projects in Mill Valley and Sausalito would qualify. It is important to note that funds would be drawn down more quickly for smaller projects. Eells asked if we could consider 1.5 rather than double. Lethco said yes. Kallins said that the purpose of the program is to encourage more housing near transit hubs and that we're trying to tweak the program to provide that incentive by increasing the per-bedroom award.

Pendoley asked Collins whether the Doubling Award would actually be an incentive. Collins indicated that she believed it would encourage people to apply for the funds, especially for non-profit groups to team with municipalities to apply for funds.

Kallins noted that there are so many projects that communities need and that if we just did the TLC capital program, it would fulfill a lot of needs right away by getting these projects going, rather than waiting until after the HIP cycle. Erickson noted that there is no single project in Marin that would meet the Regional HIP requirements. Lethco noted that HIP is a capital program, but it focuses projects around higher density housing. Kallins noted that if we tweak the program around that results in not fulfilling the bicycle, pedestrian or transit needs. Collins stated that because this is a pilot project and we could re-examine the program after a year or two to determine whether there are any nibbles out there. Kallins expressed concern that if we reduce the number of bedrooms that the cost of the housing will go up. Erickson noted that that is not the case. We could consider more than doubling the bonus for affordable or workforce housing in order to encourage more affordable housing. Lethco noted that the cities will get to choose how to use the money once they receive it, provided there is a link. Boro asked whether there was no obligation to spend the money at the project. Lethco clarified that if the connection already existed, then the city could decide to spend it elsewhere.

Yates asked for a description of a HIP project. Erickson summarized a HIP project in Berkeley, where the jurisdiction packaged 3-4 housing projects together for a grant amount of approximately \$1M. The old Santa Fe right of way 3 blocks north of University Avenue will be a 12 foot paved pathway and a signalized intersection to connect housing, commercial and school uses. Erickson noted that most of the HIP projects are ultimately pedestrian oriented projects. Kallins wants to make sure that those types of projects are not overlooked or shortchanged. Yates noted that mutual collaboration to put together housing and pedestrian oriented projects will help us. Lethco explained that the flexibility built into our program would actually be in the benefit of pedestrian oriented projects.

Kallins would like to see more balance between HIP and the TLC Capital. Rodriguez noted that this was discussed at the last meeting. Kallins is concerned that the HIP gets to go first and then whatever is left over can be awarded to capital projects. Erickson explained that the group expressed concern with the lack of housing in the county and that it was directed to prioritize the encouragement of housing. Pendoley stated that he was pleased with the direction given at the last meeting. Chu stated that the program will favor San Rafael or Novato and that the smaller cities will likely not view the program as an opportunity for their communities. We should recognize this fact and focus on where we are most likely to see a benefit. Kallins stated that she didn't think there would be any benefit for SR2S, other than in San Rafael or Novato. Chu noted that although there would only be a funding benefit to San Rafael or Novato that other communities will receive some benefit from transportation improvements in San Rafael or Novato [Carey, I believe he said something along these lines, Phil]

Mansourian and Rodriguez noted that there was consensus on the direction provided at the last meeting and this consensus is further strengthened by the doubling of the award. Lethco explained that TAM will be the final decision maker on this issue and that staff will note to the TAM Commissioners that there are concerns that SR2S projects will not qualify. Pendoley noted that there may be a project in Larkspur that could qualify with the "Doubling" option. Chu stated that he believed that it is highly unlikely that Larkspur would not have any projects that qualify. Lethco countered by saying he thought that there may be projects in the future that may qualify but we do not know of them at this current point in time.

Erickson noted that it should be reported back to the councils that the Toolkit can help the jurisdictions encourage projects that would qualify for HIP.

Rodriguez has some comments on the program description that she will discuss directly with Lethco. She wanted a further description of "transit stops" and "transit stations." Staff noted that the term "transit" includes bus, train and ferry modes. Mansourian asked if it would be helpful to map them. Erickson noted that mapping has been done and that most of the transit stops were occurring within the required distance criteria.

4. Discussion on Draft TOD/PeD Principles, Benefits, and Issues/Barriers

Erickson summarized the new additions to the Principles and Benefits, and Issues and Barriers document. Comments from interviews with Marin nonprofit and for-profit developers, as well as comments from the Workforce Housing stakeholder group meeting, were added to the document.

Rodriguez asked how these issues will be used in the final document. Erickson explained that the issues will be the starting point from where we will develop the Toolkit. It will include specific policy or design recommendations based upon our findings.

Pendoley asked for further explanation on the Workforce Housing comment about businesses leaving the county. He noted that businesses don't have much room to expand because of the limited space, but it's not necessarily the exiting of business on a whole. There is some turnover for businesses. Boro noted that the County Economic Commission recently spoke about this. Pendoley noted that the space is not left vacant and that new businesses fill those vacancies. Kallins noted that nonprofit agencies have a very difficult time securing staff persons because of the cost of housing. Yates explained that Target sometimes commutes people in because they cannot get a steady workforce here in Marin. Collins noted that the County has a study of where county employees commute from. Pendoley noted that the fact is that we lose corporate business that we want to keep. Boro suggested that in order to get a better idea of why the businesses are leaving, they should be asked why they left. Pendoley is concerned that it is not the relevance that is stated there. It should be that we cannot retain some companies that we want to keep.

Eells asked whether we would build in the city-developed list referred to on Page 1 into the TLC/HIP Program. Should we prioritize the projects mentioned in the city's needs list? Erickson noted that it should be the cities that prioritize them, not the Program. Erickson noted that the Planning Directors Association has been involved and included in the TLC/HIP Program development, as requested. Chu noted that some of the principles in the document are conflicting with the smaller jurisdictions who do not have large parcels or high zoning densities.

Erickson asked if there were any other comments on the feedback listed in the document. He clarified what type of feedback was desired from the TPLUS AC.

Taylor –top on page 7. Is this really our experience? It's in all community and county plans. Kallins noted that there is plenty of political support, but there is actually a lack of community support and the lack of the ability to follow through on the policy when there is community pressure against the project at the final project approval phase. People are not objecting to the project because it is "affordable". Katz disagreed and stated that the loudest negative comments are those who have the most effect on the decision on the project. Kallins agrees with Katz. Even some who support low income needs would oppose the project if the density is too high. Taylor stated that it's difficult for people to understand a good transit system because we don't have one.

Taylor – directly under the previous one. She wants some language in there that it is in the best interest of the community to have mixed levels of housing for different income levels. We should not have a homogeneous housing development. Mansourian noted that he has experienced higher incidences of complaints when mixed levels of housing are directly next to each other.

5. Public Comments

No comments from the public were received.

6. Confirm/Schedule Next Meeting Date and Time